

1786.

C A S E. 1245 L 49  
O F

JOHN JACKSON,

PATENTEE of the Edinburgh THEATRE-ROYAL.

THE late Lord Elibank, Lord Alemore, and other Gentlemen, from public motives, and particularly for the purpose (as they expected) of bringing the then Theatre into credit, took the property of the House and its appurtenances under their own care, and leased out the premisses to several Managers, one after another.

THE scheme entirely failed, a large debt having been contracted, and the House at last was destroyed in a riot.

THE Gentlemen applied for an Act of Parliament, in order to establish a Theatre by *Royal Patent*, and as soon as that Patent was obtained, they conveyed it to *David Ross* of Covent Garden.

DAVID Ross published proposals for the erection of a New Theatre, upon the same footing with other Patent Houses in England, and for that purpose the sum of L. 2500 Sterling was subscribed, and paid in shares of L. 100 Sterling each, by *twenty five Gentlemen*.

THE conditions were, that each Subscriber should receive three pounds of interest, per annum, with personal admission to all entertainments of the place, and that the patent, house, ornaments, scenery, and wardrobe, should be mortgaged to them for their security.

MR Ross immediately built and furnished a new Theatre in a commodious situation, and in a very respectable style.

BESIDES the L. 2500 of subscription money, this Theatre with other parts of the undertaking cost upwards of L. 3000 Sterling. To these sums are to be added other debts, annuities, and conditions of the bargain, which at the lowest estimation amounted to L. 1000 more.

45.1.16. 527  
A



THIS

THIS advance being above the abilities of the Patentee, it involved him in debt and inconvenience.

HE was obliged to let the Theatre to other Managers,—first to *Foot*, next to *Digges*, afterwards to *Wilkinson* and *Corri*. The rents received did not return five per cent. upon the original advance, and consequently there remained no fund for discharging the Patentee's debts.

THE intermediate Lessees having no interest in the property, used the Theatre as they found it, without making the necessary additions and repairs, and consequently, the scenery, wardrobe, and ornaments, were at last worn out, and the fabric of the house itself neglected.

IN this situation, Mr *Ross* sold the whole property and Patent to *John Jackson*, upon several conditions, and particularly that he, Jackson, should engage to pay the debts of the Theatre, and find security to Mr *Ross* for an annuity of L. 150 per annum, for the term of his life.

MR JACKSON immediately gave the house a complete repair, put on a new roof, and furnished it with scenery, ornaments, properties, and a wardrobe superior to the original ones, and to any in the kingdom, out of London.

THE shortness of the Edinburgh season of acting, and the great distance of the place from London, rendered the engagement of Performers of merit difficult and expensive, and to this circumstance, the personal misfortunes attending Mr *Ross* and his Lessees, were in part to be attributed.

To remedy this evil, Mr Jackson built a new Theatre at Glasgow in a centrical situation.—The building and furnishings upon this house, entirely advanced upon his own property and credit, amounts to L. 3500 Sterling.—The scheme answered expectation. The entertainments of both cities were thereby rendered more systematic and respectable. A petition now lies in the House of Commons, subscribed by his Grace the Duke of Hamilton, and the first names in town and

and country, for liberty to bring in a bill to licence the Theatre of Glasgow.

MR JACKSON, ever since he undertook the management, has exerted his utmost industry and abilities in the discharge of his duty.

HE has every year traversed the three kingdoms, and sometimes twice in one year, in order to procure the best Performers.—Nor is there a person of any merit upon the stage, who have not visited Edinburgh, or to whom he has not made particular applications and suitable offers.—Excepting that of *Mr Foot*, the companies under his care, have been superior to any brought by former Managers, and at all times inferior to none in the Island out of London.

DURING his management, the debts of the House have been discharged, its credit restored, and the Performers regularly paid—and this is more than can be said to have happened under any former Manager, excepting Messrs. Foot and Wilkinson, who only performed one season each.—Upon the whole, Mr Jackson humbly maintains, that no specific charge can be brought against him in the exercise of his duty.

HE did not know till of late, that a number of Gentlemen were meditating to procure a Patent in their own names for the Edinburgh Theatre, upon the expiration of the current term. He imagined that the failure of the same scheme in the hands of men of the first character and abilities in the kingdom, would have banished every idea of repeating the experiment.

ABOUT a twelve month ago, however, a proposal was transmitted to London, to be laid before the Lord Chamberlain, for a Patent in the names of *these Gentlemen*.

THIS paper took no notice of the present Theatre Royal, of the Proprietors, Subscribers to it, or of Mr Jackson the Patentee. It contained three capital mistakes in point of fact, and held out a principle exploded in the history and practice of all the Theatres in the kingdom.

THE *first* of these mistakes was, that David Ross upon the erection of the Theatre Royal, had been generously entrusted with the management by the public, without any valuable consideration upon his part.

*2dly*, THAT Mr Ross had betrayed his trust, by converting it into a quiet sinecure-office of L. 500 *per annum* to himself.

*3dly*, THAT Mr Jackson had paid no valuable consideration to Mr Ross for a conveyance of the Theatre.

*4thly*, THAT upon the expiration of Theatrical Patents, the obtaining the next term was a matter of interest alone, and that the Lord Chamberlain of England was accustomed to grant new Patents, without the least regard to the property of the subsisting Theatres, or the persons concerned in them.

THE error *in principle* was, That the best constitution of a Theatre must be to vest the Patent in a number of Gentlemen, who might *appoint Managers under themselves from time to time, upon short leases*, according to their merit; and that the entertainment would thereby be improved, and the amusement of the public better insured.

MR JACKSON having got notice of these proposals, made specific objections to it, in which he explained the mistake respecting Mr Ross and himself. He also endeavoured to correct the error with regard to the nature of Theatrical property, and to point out the more just and equitable practice of the Lord Chamberlain in the renovation of Patents. He concluded by an humble endeavour to demonstrate, that the principle of the scheme was entirely wrong, that similar plans had been frequently tried, and as often failed, and that *short leases* were incompatible with improvement, or even existence of Theatres.

THE answers he received were in substance—

“ THAT if David Ross did not make profit, it was his own fault,  
“ he might have done it—That he, Mr Jackson, had profited, and  
“ consequently

“ consequently had no claim to further advantages beyond the current term.

“ THE fact was denied with regard to the nature of property and practice of the Lord Chamberlain, and the assertion was repeated that upon the expiration of current Patents, there remains no sort of connection between the property of the Theatre and the new licence.

“ THAT short leases from a Board of Gentlemen formed the best constitution of a Theatre.

“ THAT the property of the house would remain uninjured in the persons of Mr Jackson and his Subscribers; that as to himself, he was not to be excluded from a competition for the management in future; that if he had taken so much pains as he alledged, he might trust his pretensions to the Gentlemen concerned; That if he was not appointed, the Gentlemen would take a lease of the house if they found it for their advantage, if otherwise, they would build a new house for themselves, and that he and the other Subscribers would then be at liberty to sell their scenes and cloaths at the best market they would, and to convert their Theatre into shops, manufactories, or any other purpose they thought proper; and in short, that it behoved the proposed scheme to take place.”

MR JACKSON, under the highest veneration for the Gentlemen whose names appear in the proposal, must certainly find excuse with them, and with the public, if he acknowledges a reluctancy in consenting to such a change in situation and circumstance. In his own mind he remains convinced, that a majority of these Gentlemen have taken little concern in the businefs, and have not as yet sufficiently considered the particulars of the case: He is also convinced that the person, or persons by whom it seems hitherto to have been conducted, have not had an opportunity of acquiring knowledge of Theatrical affairs, and as it is extremely probable that the same persons would continue to take the concern on themselves, he justly dreads the ruin of his property, and a second fall of the Edinburgh Theatre as the consequence.

. THE error in the conduct of this scheme soon appeared from better authority

authority than the humble suggestions of Mr Jackson. Upon the application being renewed, the Gentlemen were given to know, that the proposal of vesting *the use* of the Theatre in one set of men, and *leaving the property in another*, was novel, nugatory, and against the established rules hitherto observed by the Lord Chamberlain of England in such cases.

CONVINCED of the error, the next step taken was no doubt judged more political, but it by no means tended to increase Mr Jackson's hopes under the new plan. Since it appeared necessary to do justice to the property of the Theatre, an idea was conceived of *limiting that justice to the Gentlemen, Subscribers*, in order to deprive him of their support, after which it was to be supposed that his interest would easily be born down. And,

FOR this purpose, the following declaration was presented to a Committee of the *Gentlemen, Proprietors*, of the present Theatre, who by this time had justly taken alarm.

“ FROM the time that the scheme was on foot for getting a new  
 “ Patent for the Edinburgh Theatre, in name of certain Trustees,  
 “ it was all along understood that the Gentlemen who held shares  
 “ in the Theatre were *to continue upon the same footing as at present*,  
 “ both with respect to the right of admission, and the pay-  
 “ ment of their interest.—For these the Gentlemen will have the  
 “ following security if the scheme goes on.

“ 1<sup>mo</sup>, THE heritable security which they have at present upon  
 “ the building of the Theatre and its appurtenances.

“ 2<sup>do</sup>, *Whoever gets an assigntion or a lease of the Patent from*  
 “ *the Trustees, will be taken bound to give admission to the sub-*  
 “ *scribers and to pay their interest upon the commencement of*  
 “ *the new Patent, upon their assigning to him, if demanded, to*  
 “ *the same extent, the claim which they have upon their present*  
 “ *security.*

“ 3<sup>to</sup>, *A subsidiary assigntion to be granted to the Patent itself*  
 “ *for security of the admission and interest to the subscription,*  
 “ *from the commencement of the new Patent.*

“ 4<sup>to</sup>, *The*

“ *4to*, THE obligation upon the Assignee or Lessee acting under the new Patent to admit the subscribers and to pay their interest, to be the same, whether he performs *in the present Theatre*, or finds it for his interest to build another—and in this last case, he shall be obliged to grant the Subscribers, if they demand it, a security upon their assigning to him their heritable right upon the present Theatre, and allowing him the same power of redemption, which was originally given David Ross.

“ IN this way, it is thought the Subscribers will have every security that can reasonably be demanded for the enjoyment of their privileges under the new Patent, and fully as good as the security which they held formerly.”

MR JACKSON, with great deference, had previously informed the Gentlemen concerned in the new scheme, that the intention of the legislature by the statute made in behalf of Theatres, was not to alter the nature of Theatrical property, but to protect the church and the state from the petulance and abuse which had crept into the representations of the stage; and, that so long as Managers and Proprietors conducted the entertainments with proper decorum, it had been the gracious and equitable practice of the Lord Chamberlain of England to renew Patents from time to time *to the possessors of the property*. It is this equitable right of renewal, which constitutes the Theatrical property of Great Britain, and which without it would be of no value. The Theatres of London have lately been sold for the great sums of L. 64,000 and L. 70,000 Sterling, and that at a time when the term of one of the Patents of these houses was within a few years of expiration. 85,000

THE *scenery, wardrobe, and brick-walls*, sold or separated from the *use* which they served upon the spot, would not have brought a sixth part of that sum, and no man would hazard his money upon such an adventure.

THE Theatres of *Bath, Chester, Hull, York, Liverpool, &c. &c.* are all upon the very same footing as that of Edinburgh. They are all *properties* growing in proportion to their respective situations, and the *Patents have been regularly renewed to their respective Proprietors*.

THIS justice the Stage enjoys even under the arbitrary governments of Europe. The Theatres of *Paris* arose from a religious society, termed *Confrerie de la Passion*. The Brotherhood represented sacred subjects \*; and when these pieces came afterwards to give place to modern Comedy, the first religious actors retained notwithstanding the property and the licence from the Crown. By them the whole was at last conveyed to the Company of the *Hotel de Burgogne*, in confideration of a certain annuity or annual-rent.—*Moliere* founded the other Parisian Company, and the Proprietors of the present Theatres of Paris are the lineal successors of these two by succession, or purchase without interruption.

PUBLIC licences to Theatres all over Europe, are intended and used for no other purposes, than to insure the observance of propriety and decorum in the conduct of the stage.

IN England the holding Theatres under the high jurisdiction, to which they are by law subjected, is of more importance than in other kingdoms where the press is also under controul, because the measure operates as a check upon authors more than actors †. With regard to the latter, the powers vested by the Act of Parliament have improved the property of the stage, and insured the bread of such Managers as chose to behave with propriety, and to avoid every occasion of giving offence. The compliment paid to the Duke of Grafton Lord Chamberlain (by Mr Colley Cibber,) at the time the law passed, may with justice be continued to his noble successors.—“ It is evident (says Cibber) that the power

“ of

—————\* *Une troupe grossière*

*En public a Paris y monta la premiere,*

*Et sottement zélé en sa simplicité*

*Joua les Saints, la Vierge, et Dieu, par piété.*

*Vide Boileau—l'Art Poetique Chant. 3me, et les Notes—*

*Voltaire—Vie de Moliere—*

*Le Grand Encyclopedie—voce Comedien.*

† A licentious writer, whose pieces were exhibited in the *Haymarket*, was the occasion of the act of Parliament.—*Sir Robert Walpole* was the chief mark of his satire: But (as Cibber says in his apology, p. 231) “ He went on knocking down all distinctions, Religion, Laws, Government, Priests, Judges, and Ministers.

*Gustavus Vasa*, by *Brook*; and the *Elcanora of Thomson*, were the two pieces first prohibited in virtue of the statute.

" of that white staff, ever since it has been in the illustrious hand  
 " that now holds it, has been used with the utmost lenity."

THE late scheme proposed for Edinburgh seems to be founded upon a great *classical error*; or, in other words, a total forgetfulness — *age* of the presentage and country. In Greece and Rome the public furnished magnificent Theatres with all their splendid decorations. The public therefore had an unquestionable right to the exclusive choice or nomination of every person concerned in the conduct of these national spectacles. In Europe, the whole expence attending the erection and support of Theatres has been, with very few exceptions, left upon the fortunes and industry of private individuals. These men, therefore, have been every where permitted to manage and conduct their own property like other subjects under regulations consonant to the police of the respective countries.

UPON revival of the stage, plays were introduced to Court.--- In the days of Elizabeth, James, and Charles the First, the exhibition was attended with great expence. The scenery and architecture of Ben Johnson's masques were designed by Sir Inigo Jones--- The actors were the household, and thence derived the title of *his Majesty's servants*. of  
A

AT the Restoration, Sir William Davenant, and Sir Harry Killigrew, undertook to build and decorate a house entirely *at their own expence*, for the entertainment of the public, as well as the Court: Therefore it was, that Charles the II. granted a Patent to them and their heirs, and assignees *for ever*. This Patent is the authority of Covent Garden at this moment.

WHATEVER interest the public may have, and the people contend for in the *election of their clergymen*, yet so sacred is property, that the right of *patronage* has continued for ages, and still exists in the successors of those who originally endowed the church, or bestowed property upon it. *Mr Jackson* begs pardon for making use of this illustration in speaking upon the present subject, but the justice and aptness of it will, it is hoped, obtain his excuse.

IT

It is to be remembered, that the first patent for Edinburgh was given to the proprietors even of an unlicensed house. By the declaration before engrossed, given in by the Gentlemen concerned in the new scheme, it is admitted and established that the property of the Edinburgh Theatre was entitled to remain unviolated: An offer to do partial justice, or more properly to do justice to the *mortgagees*, in order to bring ruin upon the estate itself, is to hold that estate to be *out of the protection of equity*. It is the most explicit confession of a wrong that could be given in any case. Mr Jackson acknowledges, that, as a British subject, he feels little apprehension from a proposal in such a questionable shape. The original scheme was at least more consistent. It roundly denied justice to the Theatre, and all concerned in it. The modification now given in acknowledges the wrong, and yet proposes to remedy that wrong only in part. A kind of justice is offered to those who are supposed to have power to vindicate their rights. Mr Jackson however happy to find, that his Subscribers have shewn no inclination to desert him. In all other cities they are the natural supports of the Manager, and those of Edinburgh will not give place to a set of Gentlemen whose interest in the business is *wholly ideal*. If the right of applying for a new Patent belongs to any description of men, it is certainly in those who originally contributed to the erection of the Theatre itself. It continues to be the object of the new opposition to deprive them of this right. They found themselves excluded in a body from the nomination in the late scheme, and were not even consulted in the formation of it. The adventure of their money to establish a regular Theatre in the Capital of their country seems now to be imputed to them as a fault or a crime.

THE proposal, even in so far as it respects *the interest of the Proprietors*, demonstrates the scheme to be fundamentally erroneous: It directly tends to inextricable confusion. In place of their own house and their own Manager, the present Proprietors are, in all probability, to have another house and another Manager, or a variety of different Managers who have no dependence upon them, but are answerable to other masters. These Gentlemen are not, it seems, in future to act with the new Patentees, but are to be remitted to the Substitute or Manager appointed by them. By this person the annualrent due to the former is to be paid.

paid. By him the security is to be given upon the new Theatre; and to him the transfers of the old property are to be made. It is unnecessary to point out the inconveniences, disputes, and mischief which must attend the existence of so many jarring interests. Under such a constitution no Theatre could subsist. The original benefactors of the Edinburgh Theatre are to be entitled to bare admission into a house the property of third parties, and to an uncertain security for their money. If another Theatre be built at the expence of different Contributors, the transfers of the old mortgage must be postponed to those necessary created by the new erection.

THE scheme is further erroneous with regard to the interests of the public. By the present constitution the body of the Subscribers vary with the times; one or other of the shares is generally at market, and any Gentleman who wishes to take a concern in the Theatre may become of the number.

By the new plan this popular rotation is entirely excluded. The Theatre, and its concerns, are to be vested in a fixed Board of individuals, who will have the nomination of their successors. This Board, according to their own declaration, are to have power without property, and a fixed patronage without paying any price.

AFTER all, it does not appear how such a plan can be executed. A new Theatre cannot be erected without a *new set of subscribers*; and consequently, in place of easing the expence of entertainment, it must be loaded with the admission of all the old subscribers, and a double number at least of new ones. This circumstance would of itself be fatal. It formerly ruined the Theatres of Dublin, though a much larger city than Edinburgh.

IF the Patent, at the expiration of each term be liable, by the interest of individuals, to separation from the property; or, in other words, if the patronage of the Theatre must revert to those who may happen to be in power at the time, another set of Gentlemen who may disapprove of the management of the former Patentees, or chuse to share their power, will have a title to interfere; and they may also chuse to build another Theatre. The entertainment of consequence must be thrown back, and never can advance to that

that perfection which the accumulation of property bestows upon it every where else.

THE Gentlemen now in suit of the Patent, hold out that they do not propose to be *Managers*, but only to retain the power of nomination of Managers in their own hands, and to grant leases of the Patent for short terms, renewable according to their opinion of the conduct of the possessor. *This is the very worst of all bad plans that ever was adopted for the management of a Theatre, and has been every where exploded by experience.* The Gentlemen who formerly tried it in Edinburgh, were not acting Managers—they appointed other persons under them in that department—their plan and intention was the very same—and its consequences are sufficiently known \*.

If short leases, of *three or five* years be the best of possible or known constitutions of a Theatre, it follows, that the Legislature has erred in authorising Patents for the long term of *twenty-one* years.

BUT supposing them to be right, a material question remains to be answered—Why should the power of granting such short leases be taken from the great Constitutional Officer of the Crown, and vested in a board of individuals—Mr Jackson, and every person in his situation will chuse to derive their possession from the Lord Chamberlain, because they will then have an impartial Judge to appeal to for the right of renewal, in place of losing their bread by accident, opinion, or prejudice.

THE new plan for Edinburgh does not seem to have been duly considered, or digested into any regular form. The property of the Theatre and its appurtenances must either be *in the Gentlemen Patentees themselves*, or it must be *in the acting Manager* under them. By a paper formerly given in in their name, the property was

to

\* The grand Theatre of Aungier-Street, Dublin, was erected by a liberal subscription of Noblemen and Gentlemen, with the intention of applying the profits to future decorations, and to the encouragement of actors. The scheme in theory appeared to be excellent, but the execution proved impracticable. A Committee of Subscribers for some time directed the business.—Every thing went wrong—The Gentlemen found themselves obliged to surrender to Players, and by them the ruin of the whole was completed.

to be *in their own persons*. They spoke of themselves only. It had been suggested upon the part of Mr Jackson, that if their proposal was carried into execution, it would return the house and its contents useless upon the hands of the Proprietors. The Gentlemen answered in the following words, "So far from it, that it places *the Patentees* in the power of the Proprietors. *The former* must either "take a lease of the house from the Proprietors, and pay them rent "for it, or *they must build a new house*. In like manner, they "must either purchase scenery, dresses, &c. or they must look for "others at a distance."

THE paper last given in (which is before engrossed) reverses this part of the plan: It declares the property not intended to be in their own persons, but *in the Managers under them*.

Now, to erect a Theatre and furnish it equal to the present, will cost the sum of L.6000 at least. If this money be advanced by the Gentlemen themselves, and let to a Manager upon a lease, then the very same thing that formerly happened to Lord Elibank, Alemore, &c. &c. and that happened to the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Dublin, will, in all human probability, happen once more. If on the other hand, the money, or the greatest part of it is to be advanced by *Managers* under them, where will persons be found to risk their property upon such an uncertain tenure? Are they to sink a sum of this magnitude upon the grotesque materials of a Theatre, and have the use of them wholly dependent upon others. Is such an undertaker to be told, (as Mr Jackson has been in the present case) by a Board of Gentlemen, "That no injury is done "him by appointment of another in his place? That he may convert his house into shops or manufactories, and that he may sell "his cloaths and scenes at the best market he can?" A person the least versant in the affairs of the Stage, knows that a L. 1000 of that kind of property fitted to a place, and its particular entertainments, would not bring L. 100 upon removal. A man in this unhappy situation could not even procure credit upon his property. What tradesman in his senses would give credit upon a stock intrinsically of little value, and liable to be reduced to nothing at the mere will of third parties.

A THEATRE upon a short lease is the same as *a farm*, the possessor will make it yield its utmost, and regards not the condition he leaves it in. Convert the same farm into a freehold, and the place will receive the produce of successive possessors. The London Theatres in the beginning of this century, did not exceed L. 5000 Sterling. They arose to L. 12,000, then to L. 20,000, and so on, till they have arrived to L. 70,000 and upwards. Could this have happened upon another footing than that of property? Would any person give so much money for brick walls, painted canvas, and old cloaths, did they not think they were purchasing at the same time, the equitable right of obtaining a continuation of the liberty of using these goods in the only manner that a suitable return could be expected from them?—By a similar progress, the Edinburgh Theatre will rise according to the length of possession; and as the property increases, so will the entertainment, for this plain reason, that the *interest or stake of the proprietor will be the greater.*

ANOTHER object of the new plan is said to be to lighten the burdens upon the Manager, and thereby enable him to give more money to good actors. Every Manager's *interest* must determine him to get the best performers he can. This lies with the public, and will always be determinable by them alone. If the public do not make it the interest of the Manager to procure the best actors, then the ease of his rent will have no effect. The Gentlemen take it constantly for granted that they would have nothing to do but to appoint one manager after another: But surely, it is not difficult to foresee that this same Manager must have a complete Theatre to perform in, and a respectable wardrobe to dress his characters.---Now, if these shall be provided at the expence of the Gentlemen for him, he must certainly make a return sufficient for their indemnification. On the other hand, if the Gentlemen take the present Theatre or its appurtenances from Mr Jackson, an adequate rent must be paid for them, so that matters must evidently return to the present situation.---Mr Jackson thinks himself abler to afford better entertainments in his own house, than any renter of it possibly could do.

THE last and capital reason for the present plan is said to be, that

that Mr Jackson may *sell* the Theatre, may *die*, or become bankrupt, in which case, the entertainment of the public will be at the mercy of his *creditors, successors, or purchasers.*

THE consequence of these casualties are not left to theory or conjecture: Experience has sufficiently removed every apprehension from them. Supposing Mr Jackson to *make sale* of the Theatre, the purchaser must immediately carry on the entertainment, or submit to ruin.—How often have all the Theatres in England been bought and sold in halves and quarters, and was it ever heard that the public were injured by that circumstance? Daily experience also shows, that a land estate in place of suffering, gains in improvement by a change of masters. The very same thing happens to Theatres—The *Haymarket*, in the late *Mr Foot's* time had no decorations or wardrobe, equal to what it now has under the purchaser *Mr Coleman*. The property in point of value was comparatively trifling. As to *bankruptcy*, that is only another word for changing hands.—The London Theatres have been divided into shares, and these shares have been sold for the payment of debts before the Masters in Chancery.—It behoves creditors instantly to sell or to lose the fund of their payment—How often has the Opera-house of London fallen to creditors, and been disposed of by them? and How often have all the attempts of Noblemen and Gentlemen, both individually and in societies, to regulate it by themselves, proved abortive? *Succession* makes no kind of difference in the thing—The heirs in all cases must instantly either sell or let—The entertainment never stops, and so soon as a purchaser comes, improvements follow.

THE real danger lies in the very circumstance which is the object of the new proposal, *the letting the Theatre in short leases*—Hence from the time that Mr David Ross let his property in that manner, *the Theatre fell more and more into decay*.—He wished to draw his rent with as few deductions as possible, and the possessor neither would add to or support a stock that was not his own—The credit of the Edinburgh Theatre fell of consequence, and the price of the shares sunk. It revived with the last purchase by *Mr Jackson*, its credit was restored, and it is a fact publicly known, that the shares started to their former value.

BESIDES

BESIDES a large property in the Edinburgh Theatre, Mr Jackson, as already mentioned, has advanced the sum of L. 3500, upon building and furnishing a Theatre at Glasgow.—Both must hereafter be possessed by one Manager, and if he shall obtain the same justice which has never yet been denied to any person in his circumstances, it is his fixed determination to make them the business of his life. In order to remove all objections, Mr Jackson is ready to come under such a system of controul, as shall be consistent with the property, and at the same time answer every purpose requisite for the security and interest of the public.

With this view, he humbly apprehends, the very best measure he can adopt, is to exclude himself, and all future Proprietors from the *power of leasing*, and to provide, that upon his leaving the place, his death, or his failure, the property shall be valued by persons chosen by those who are in the right of controul at the time, on the one part, and by himself, his successors, or creditors, on the other, and then exposed at that price to a fair and public sale.—By that means the Theatre will not only be supported, but the property will increase in value like those of London, and always bear proportion to the progress of the city.

JOHN JACKSON.



JOHN JACKSON  
PATENTEE of the EDINBURGH  
THEATRE-ROYAL.

